

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on August 4, 2011 (hereafter "Office Action"). Applicants have amended claims 8, 9, 11, 13 and 21. Applicants have not added any new matter by these amendments. Applicants have not canceled nor added any claims. Applicants previously canceled claims 3, 5, 10 and 16. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11-15 and 17-22 are now pending in the application, of which claim 1, 8 and 14 are independent.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, claims 8, 9 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 21 was listed as being rejected in the Office Action Summary, but was not specifically noted in the Detailed Action. For purposes of this response, Applicants presume that claim 21 was inadvertently omitted from the listing of rejected claims on page 3 of the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants address the rejection of claim 21 under that presumption. Applicants now address these rejections.

Claim 8 was rejected as lacking antecedent basis for “the incoming datagram.” Applicants have amended claim 8 to address this concern. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 8 on this basis is obviated and should be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 9 and 11-13 (and presumably claim 21) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, on the basis that the “specification does not sufficiently describe the structure, material, or acts for performing the ‘lookup means for performing a lookup’.”, as required under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph six. Without addressing the merits of the rejection, which are not conceded, Applicants note that claims 8, 9, 11, 13 and 21 have been amended such that they no longer invoke 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph six. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 8, 9, 11-13 and 21 is moot and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request notification of such allowance. The Examiner may telephone Applicants' attorney (360-930-3533) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intended to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants believe that no fees are due in connection with this Amendment and Response. However, if necessary, please charge any required fees, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3521 referencing Attorney Docket No. 0063-106001/BU3034.

Respectfully submitted,

Brake Hughes Bellerman LLP
Customer No.: 57246

Date November 4, 2011

By: /Paul W. Churilla – Reg. No. 47,495/
Paul W. Churilla
Reg. No. 47,495